THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIII FEBRUARY, 1960 No. 476

Editorial

ONE of the most embarrassing of the many embarrassing questions that are put to Christian apologists is why the Church was so insensitive to the appalling hardships of the factory workers during the early phases of the industrial revolution. There is never likely to be a satisfactory answer to this question. It is best to admit the force of the indictment, and to try to make sure that in our generation we also are not being blind to regions and forms of human suffering that may be less obvious and cannot be so readily remedied by Acts of Parliament.

Nevertheless, the question remains open for investigation: How did Christian men in fact react to the evils that attended the onset of industrialization? Mr J. C. Gill, in his book *The Ten Hours Parson* (S.P.C.K., 30s.), which is described as a study in "Christian Social Action in the Eighteen-Thirties", supplies some reasons for supposing that statements on the subject that have been given currency by reputable social historians like the Hammonds and Dr G. M. Trevelyan require some qualification. The hero of his book is the Rev. G. S. Bull, an Evangelical clergyman who played a leading part in awakening public opinion to the most scandalous aspects of child labour in factories, especially in Yorkshire and Lancashire. It was Bull who persuaded Lord Shaftesbury to take up the cause of the Ten Hours' Bill, and Mr Gill rightly maintains that the credit that has been justly accorded to Shaftesbury has obscured the powerful and courageous initiative that had previously been taken by other Christian laymen and by clergymen.

Bull himself is a most engaging character, and we hope Mr Gill may be able to produce a full biography of him, for the materials are apparently available. He was a Tory who advocated reform only by constitutional methods, but his attacks on the millowners and their Whig and Liberal accomplices were splendidly pungent and incisive. His "Protest addressed to the Commissioners for Factory Enquiry" on 4 June 1833, which is printed in an appendix (pp. 194 ff.), is by itself evidence that the accents of prophecy were not muted in England at that time. It might well be read on occasion in place of a sermon, with an explanation of its context. Mr Gill elsewhere quoted what he calls a piece of "pre-Churchill Churchillism", in which Bull spoke of the callous employers as "a race whose whole wisdom consists in that cunning which enables them to devise the cheapest possible means for getting out of the youngest possible workers the greatest possible amount of labour, in the shortest possible amount of time, for the least possible amount of wages . . ." (pp. 146 f.).

It is clear that many other churchmen were associated with Bull

in his campaigns on behalf of the "white slaves". Mr Gill's book does not however cover enough ground nor is it documented with sufficient precision to warrant firm conclusions about the proportions of concern and indifference in the Church during the eighteen-thirties. Many more special studies need to be made which will utilize the sources of information available in local newspapers, etc. Meanwhile, historians should be more careful to qualify their statements than they have been in the past.

* * * * *

Dr Henry Chadwick's inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford is entitled *The Circle and the Ellipse: rival concepts of authority in the early Church* (Clarendon Press, 2s. 6d.). It is a consideration of the relation between Jerusalem and Rome as centres of authority at the beginning of the Christian era. It puts the facts and the problem that they pose in a beautifully dry and sparkling manner and is as enigmatic in its conclusion as a good lecture should be.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs.—"Extract from the Minutes of the Camberwell Easter Vestry, held on 10 April 1849.

> It was moved by Mr Baker Peter Smith and seconded by Mr James Thornhill 'that the ratepayers of the parish in Vestry assembled are of the opinion that in this large and populous parish which yields so large and liberal a revenue for the vicar thereof, such vicar ought to reside therein and personally be and appear at the parish church every Sabbath and officiate then and there. That the Chairman of the Vestry do forthwith transmit a copy of their resolution to the Bishop of the Diocese and request His Lordship to compel the said vicar to reside in the parish and attend and officiate at S. Giles' Church every Sabbath.'

The Chairman, Mr Churchwarden James Pew declined putting the motion as not being included in the notice of the Vestry, whereupon Mr B. P. Smith requested that the motion might be entered in the minutes."

"Essays and Reviews"

JUST a hundred years ago, seven rebellious Anglicans published a collection of Essays which rocked the Church of England to its foundations. The attack was formidable. Frederick Temple was then Headmaster of Rugby; Oxford was represented by Mark Pattison, Baden Powell, and Jowett; Rowland Williams was Vice-Principal of Lampeter; Wilson had been Professor of Anglo Saxon at Oxford; while Goodwin (the only layman) was a well-known Egyptologist. *Essays and Reviews* provoked the Anglican crisis of the century. At first little noticed, the flames spread from periodicals to Convocation,

The Times and even to the House of Lords. The authors were charged with moral dishonesty and treason against their Church. Books were hastily written defending the traditional faith; parents wrote in anger asking for the removal of *Essays and Reviews* from school libraries; life-long friendships were broken. Williams and Wilson were suspended from their livings after trial in the Court of Arches, until the judgment was reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Jowett was prosecuted in the Vice-Chancellor's Court at Oxford, but the Assessor decided that his jurisdiction in the case was doubtful, and refused to proceed. Nevertheless, the powerful opposition of Wilberforce led to synodical condemnation of the book; and the authors, no doubt surprised by the violence of the proceedings, thereafter kept their controversial views to themselves. Temple, when he became Bishop of Exeter nine years later, felt obliged to withdraw his contribution from the book.

That in the temper of the present age a crisis of this sort is unthinkable, makes it necessary to remind ourselves, however cursorily, of the context of this ecclesiastical melodrama: of the Evangelical and Tractarian extremes in theology, recently revived under the challenge of Methodism; of the religious apathy of the country as a whole, illustrated in the first religious census of 1851; of the traditional hatred of Rome, which burst forth in the same year over the Pope's establishment of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in England; of the fundamental materialism of the age; of the idea of progress which pervaded all its thought, seen in ethics and law by the Philosophic Radicals and in history by Macaulay; and finally of that tremendous revolution in thought, the discovery of time: prehistorical, geological and evolutionary time. The clearer thinkers had already seen that Biblical infallibility had gone, and had fled, to quote one of the Essayists, "either to Rome, or to some form, equally evil, of darkness voluntary". Frightened equally by the movement to Rome and the menace of agnosticism, the theologians of the Evangelical school, to whose tenets the mass of indifferent Anglicans still paid lip service, stopped thinking altogether, and merely repeated the traditional faith in its ancient form, hoping desperately that the scientists would be proved wrong.

Their beliefs, as stated in a few typical examples from replies to *Essays and Reviews* like *Aids to Faith*, are sufficiently clear. Thus the Waynflete Professor at Oxford asserted that the evidence of miracles was vital to the truth of Christianity. The Professor of Hebrew at London claimed that all Old Testament prophecy either had been or would be literally fulfilled. Professor Rawlinson, having proved the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch—Moses' name appeared before the books, their language was archaic, and their knowledge of Egypt authentic—thought that other theories of its construction were not worth examining. Continued belief in the literal truth of the narrative was justified. As the Cambridge Professor of Divinity, Professor Browne, concluded, "we want to be assured that we have an *infallible* depository of *religious* truth". There seemed no *via media* between the traditional faith and complete agnosticism;

Pusey began his Lectures on Daniel four years later with the words "Either the book is divine, or it is an imposture".

The contributors to *Essays and Reviews* were more hopeful. They planned it as a protest against "this abominable system of terrorism, which prevents statements of the plainest facts, and makes true theology or theological speculation impossible". Jowett particularly was disturbed by the Church's lack of "intellectual young men", and convinced that it could not long survive "the mixture of truth and falsehood in religious education". Thus they wrote "to illustrate the advantage derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth, from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language, and from traditional methods of treatment". And Temple bravely wrote in the first Essay that it was treason against Christianity to fear the results either of philosophy or science or history, and welcomed extensions of knowledge of whatever kind.

But to try to reconcile the traditional statement of Christian belief with scientific knowledge could only end in that disastrous brush between Wilberforce and Huxley, which took place in the same year. Goodwin's Essay illustrates the pathetic attempts of geologists to cope with the problem. He is able to cast easy ridicule on their desperate suggestions that the first chapters of Genesis are not intended to tell us anything about the origin of the world (Archdeacon Pratt, in *Science and Scripture not at Variance*, 1859); that the "beginning" of Gen. 1. 1 refers to an indefinitely long period "before time began, antecedent to the first day" (Buckland); and that the "days" of creation really refer to geological ages (Hugh Miller). As Goodwin commented, these geologists agreed only in maintaining that the account deals merely with appearances, and that it deals with them in riddles. Jowett's conclusion, that "it is not worth while to fight on this debateable ground in the hope that a generation will pass away before we sound a last retreat", and that the relations between science and theology had for ever been settled by the admission of Galileo's discovery, seemed diabolical to the orthodox party.

And yet in one respect *Essays and Reviews* seems to give too much away. Baden Powell, in dealing with miracles, was concerned primarily to show that they could no longer serve as evidence of the truth of the Christian religion. His tedious and not very original treatment is conclusive; but his reverence for "the grand truth of the universal order and constancy of natural causes" followed Mill and Carlyle in its assumption that inductive inquiry can prove the ultimate validity of "natural laws". Thus for Baden Powell, miracles are "matters of faith, inconceivable to reason". This dichotomy is no more satisfactory than Williams' definition of miracle as the action of the Holy Spirit "through channels which His Providence ordained", which also rests on the assumption of inviolable natural laws. In fact both writers suggest that there is a naturalistic explanation for all alleged "miracles". However, as Huxley himself saw, inductive inquiry cannot prove the inviolability of natural causation;

and modern theology, while admitting the indemonstrability of miracle, seems justified in its return to Butler's conception of a "relatively settled order", which is all science needs, and which makes belief in miracles at least not necessarily irrational. But this was then in the future, and Wilson's fear that theology might "only learn to acknowledge after a deplorable defeat that there are no irreconcileable differences between itself and its opponents" proved only too well founded. At least it was a better prophecy than Williams could find in the Old Testament.

It was through Williams, whose Essay is a review of the writings of Baron Bunsen, that the results of German criticism were presented. He quotes with approval the suggestion that the Pentateuch grew gradually, that the moral lessons of the prophets are their main value, and the elimination of the prognostical element from the Old Testament. The storm of abuse was largely directed at Williams. His arguments are said to be commonplace today, but the survival of the old views is still encouraged by, for example, the use of passages like Isaiah IX in the Service of Nine Lessons.

Violent abuse was also aroused by Wilson. At the end of his essay he expressed the hope that "all, both great and small, shall find a refuge in the bosom of the Universal Parent, to repose, or to be quickened into higher life, in the ages to come, according to His will". No fewer than 11,000 clergy protested their continued belief in eternal punishment, and it was left to the Lord Chancellor to "dismiss Hell with costs" and "deny to the clergy of the Church of England their hope of everlasting damnation".

But these were really side-issues. All turned primarily on the question: how should Scripture be interpreted? The agreement of the essayists extended only to the denial that it was throughout literally true. All Temple said was that Mosaic eating laws did not apply to us. The science and history of the Bible were suspect, but the doctrine was still protected. This would leave us with belief in eternal punishment. And why, if the science and history are fallible, is the doctrine not? Nor will Williams' method of distorting the doctrine serve any better. He interpreted "justification by faith" as the "peace of mind coming from trust in God" rather than "a fiction of merit by transfer", and the Fall as "the circumscription of our spirits in the limits of flesh and time". However justifiable these ideas are on other grounds, the interpretational alchemy Williams uses to arrive at them is no better than calling a day a geological age. Wilson makes the point that none of the authors of the Bible claim infallibility; but of course we should be even less prepared to believe them if they did. He himself favours what he calls "ideological" interpretation. This is only Williams' method of distortion given a pompous name. The fullest and indeed the conclusive treatment of the subject was left to Jowett.

Jowett began by pointing out that the extreme variety in the interpretation of Scripture, which existed in the case of no other book, could be explained by the varied standpoints of the different Churches and by the progress of the human mind. Thus interpre-

tation has been "turned into a means not of discovering the true rendering, but of upholding a received one". We must recover the original text and ignore any subsequent interpretations of it. This might suggest that the original meaning is invariably true, but Jowett does not draw this conclusion, and admits that the assumption that "there can be no error in the word of God" is one of the main causes of misinterpretation. The nature of biblical inspiration can be discovered only from an examination of Scripture, and our views of it must take account of the fact that the Bible belongs to many different ages. Jowett shows how the notions of later ages have influenced interpretation, and how chance texts have been made to support doctrines of Divorce, Marriage with a Wife's Sister, Infant Baptism, Episcopacy, the Divine Right of Kings, and Original Sin. Many of the doctrines, he says, have sufficient grounds; "the weakness is the attempt to derive them from Scripture". In contrast, inconvenient sayings like those on poverty, swearing, and tolerance to other religions, are ignored. "The truth is, that in seeking to prove our own opinions out of Scripture, we are constantly falling into the fallacy of opening our eyes to one class of facts, and closing them to another." Jowett criticizes the interpretation of one part of Scripture by another part not related to it, and illustrates the impossibility of resting doctrinal interpretation on the use of a Greek particle. We forget that the Bible has no system of doctrine, and that it is Oriental, not Western. The answer to the uncertainty which thus surrounds the interpretation of the Bible is to accept the results of criticism, and to interpret the Bible "like any other book". We must admit, however uncomfortable may be the consequences, that Scripture has only one meaning—the meaning it had to the author and to the minds of his hearers. Interpretation in this way may test our faith: "but those who renounce inquiry cannot retain the right to condemn inquirers".

To interpret the Bible "like any other book" is to abandon the traditional idea of Revelation. What was therefore needed, as Pattison clearly saw, was a new idea of Revelation which could stand the test of time. He ends a dispassionate and illuminating survey of "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688-1750" with the remark:

> Whoever would take the religious literature of the present day, and endeavour to make out clearly on what basis Revelation is supposed by it to rest, whether on Authority, on the Inward Light, on Reason, on self-evidencing Scripture, or on the combination of the four, or some of them, and in what proportions, would probably find that he had undertaken a perplexing but not altogether profitless inquiry.

As Pattison had considered historical examples of all these alternatives, and shown that they had failed, it is not surprising that he later abandoned institutional religion altogether. The authority of the Universal Church had been destroyed at the Reformation. In any case, "when religion is stiffened into phrases, and these phrases are declared to be the objects of reverence, but not of intelligence, it is on the way to becoming a useless encumbrance, the rubbish

of the past blocking the road. . . . Theology then returns to the position it occupies in the Church of Rome at present, an unmeaning frostwork of dogma, out of all relation to the actual history of man." The national Church, Lutheran or Anglican, had fared no better: "nothing is allowed in the Church of England except the formulae of past thinking, which have long lost all sense of any kind". The doctrine of the Inward Light had fallen into discredit through its extravagances. The Deists had tried to appeal to good sense as the basis of religion, but in doing so had been forced to eliminate the "transcendental objects of faith". In other words, they had eliminated Revelation. Theology, properly considered, is "the contemplative, speculative habit, by means of which the mind places itself in another world than this; a habit begun here, to be raised to perfect vision hereafter". The method of argumentative proof is inappropriate to it. This suggests that for Pattison, as for Baden Powell, faith and reason just do not mix. Perhaps this was because they identified reason with evidential demonstration. But perhaps Pattison thought that his dismissal of the "formulae of past thinking" entailed the dismissal of Revelation.

Jowett's position is no clearer. The content of Christian truth seemed sufficiently obvious to him; so obvious, in fact, that he fails to give an account of it. He refers approvingly to the idea of a "progressive revelation". Later, more explicitly, he says that "Jesus Christ was the last perfect revelation of God to man", and this is still renewed in the heart and understanding. Elsewhere there are references to the "general truth" of the Bible, which seems to be "the revelation of the truth and righteousness of God, and the cry of the human heart towards Him". At another point, it appears as "a life of Christ in the soul, instead of a theory of Christ which is in a book, or written down". These contradictory statements seem to reflect a real conflict in Jowett's mind; it is at least interesting that he later defined Christianity as "living for others", and "going about doing good".

Thus Jowett oscillates between a theory of "progressive revelation", and no revelation at all. The former sounds enlightened, but means nothing, because it can be made to mean anything. It looks like a sop to the traditional view disguising Jowett's real preference for a vague moralism, which cannot be called Christianity. At least the opponents of *Essays and Reviews* knew what they meant by revelation: it was, to quote *Dialogues on "Essays and Reviews"* (edited by J. N. Darby), "the declaration of otherwise unknown truths". Goodwin himself said that "those things for the discovery of which man has faculties provided are not fit objects of a divine revelation". This conception of revelation as a deposit of truth vitiates the arguments on both sides, and because this is the traditional connotation of the word, it might be best to abandon it. But Christians will continue to believe that God was revealed in Christ. What should also be admitted is that man was left free to misinterpret that revelation, a freedom of which he has fully availed himself. Thus we should abandon the conception of revelation as "something

in a book, or written down", which Jowett rightly wanted to discard, and admit that the revelation of God in Christ must remain for us partly hidden; hidden behind the first, groping, interpretations of it in the Gospels; obscured still further by its distortion in the Epistles; and in any case, as Jowett again pointed out, far removed from us on account of our moral and spiritual blindness.

There would follow from this admission that the vision of Christ must for man be blurred, an acknowledgment of the fundamental fallibility of doctrinal statements, of which Wilson, Pattison and Jowett were so fully convinced. The latter noted with approval a growing tendency to realize that theological controversy was usually a matter of words, a tendency unfavourable to "the stability of dogmatical systems". He thought that the critical interpretation of Scripture would make us unwilling to impose any "narrow rule of religious opinion on the ever varying conditions of the human mind and Christian society".

Thus the question was raised of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Wilson's whole essay was an attempt to suggest that doctrinal statements should be abandoned, or at least left to philosophers. He argued that a national Church like the Church of England was supposed to be (and any nation had a right to a national Church) should adapt itself to majority opinion, and majority opinion was incapable of expressing itself on doctrinal matters. "Formularies of belief should embody an ethical result addressed to society." He thought that just as the Thirty-nine Articles had been given a Catholic interpretation by Newman, so they could also be interpreted to support his own views. Nevertheless, the clergy should no longer be obliged to subscribe to them—"there is always some danger lest an antiquated rule may be unexpectedly revived for the sake of an odious individual application". But Wilson did not want the Articles repealed altogether; their anti-Romish tone was still useful.

These are of course eccentricities. Few will agree with Wilson's contention that all the Church needs is agreement on ethical matters, and that it should change its beliefs to suit the majority. But his contention that the Articles could be made to mean anything was proved true at least in law. He was found guilty by Dr Stephen Lushington in the Court of Arches; Lushington emphasized that the court was a court of law, not of divinity, and restricted himself to interpreting the Articles and Formularies. The court must shut its ears to any arguments, however strong, against them. He duly found Wilson guilty, as any impartial judge on those terms would have done. But the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was able to play with words to such an extent that Wilson was acquitted. This unfortunate decision made the Articles thenceforth quite ineffective, and has thus made it possible to retain them.

Of course it is true that Anglican tradition is as much living as written. But it is hard to justify the present wide divergence between the two, and the equally wide divergence between enlightened and popular views. The fact that the most convincing Christian apologetic today is largely the work of laymen testifies to the damage done

by the retention of an outdated statement of belief, to which the Clerical Subscription Act of 1865 requires a general assent, and against which it forbids any clergyman to teach. The views attacked by the Essayists are supposed to be dead, but it is surprising how often one hears them resurrected. What the Church badly needs is a new statement of its belief, which accepts the fact of progress, avoids "any narrow rule of religious opinion", and which eschews false claims for its supremacy over alternative statements. Until we have such a positive statement, the old doctrines will continue to survive in a more or less mutilated form, the Church's message will be ineffective, and its protestations of desire for Christian unity must continue to seem hypocritical.

P. O. G. White.

Classics of Mystical and Ascetical Theology

The following essay is the result of a request from two ordinands for advice on the reading of the great spiritual writers, especially on the problem of where to start and the best translations and editions.

Before we attempt an answer it will be as well to recall and get back into focus the kind of need which prompts such a request. Mystical theology does in truth open a door to a new world of reality through which we first peep with a shock of wonder. Yet in spite of this it is only right to offer some cautions to those who propose to embark on such a course of reading.

i. The passion for spiritual truth in the form of spiritual reading is itself a phase of spiritual growth, frequently characteristic of the purgative and illuminative stages of the classical systems. Being a phase, it is liable to pass and even end abruptly after a period of ten years or so. We are apt then to wake up to the fact that we have been tasting and perceiving God vicariously through others' experience rather than our own.

ii. We cannot read everything, partly because the time required by the effort to do so would destroy all proportion in our other reading, and partly because we have to realize we are each one sort of person rather than another. Hence some spiritual authors simply leave us cold: therefore there is no point in doing violence to our minds merely for the satisfaction of feeling or saying we have read everything. Selection is imperative.

iii. There is the important question whether mystical theology can be read at all in the sense that we read other literature. Mystical theology is in the same category as much of scripture in so far as ultimately it can only be prayed, by which I mean read only in the context of prayer, as an aid to prayer, as food for contemplation, or to set contemplation in motion. Otherwise mere knowledge of spiritual states runs far ahead of our own spiritual accomplishment, so that the soul honours God with correct spiritual patter while the

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

heart strays far from him in a morass of unholy introspection or censoriousness. There comes a time in the spiritual life, after we have realized the final reality of the spiritual world, with its breath-taking splendour and order, when we are under serious obligation to be as detached about spiritual reading as about any other aid that is good in itself. Wise Catholic Christians, themselves of the widest reading, have been known to say that probably the right thing is to read about two good books on prayer and then get on with the business of praying, leaving it to the Spirit to guide us into the right kind of prayer and the right amount of spiritual reading to go with it.

iv. It is of the first importance to know what the mystical and ascetical writers are after before we plunge into them. We can become so intrigued with techniques of prayer and asceticism, and our own proficiency in them, that preoccupation with our own spiritual state takes the place of the real aim of mystical theology, which, in the classic phrase of Dionysius, is "the dim yet direct perception of God in contemplation", and union with him as a member of the church, the "holy common folk of God".

If this is the ultimate aim then we must be prepared to find our purpose of quietly reading through the classics in these fields rudely and abruptly thwarted by Divine Wisdom, whose will it may be to lead us by a new and lonely path once we have understood the essential point and got the root of the matter in us. We often forget that some of the greatest mystical theologians quote, and appear to have read, very few other mystical writers. Their knowledge of God was a truly experimental verification of biblical truth, under the guidance of the Spirit, in prayer, work, silence, and suffering. Some of them, I fancy, would have been a little nonplussed by the modern "devotional library" and a trifle sceptical about its real value. One has known those who, apart from scripture, have fed their souls on nothing but *The Imitation,* and whose sanctity has been as deep, balanced and heroic as anyone could wish for. Devotion to one book has kept the one thing needful constantly in view, and prevented the perilous achievement of becoming a connoisseur in spirituality.

v. The very fascination which these branches of theology have for the mind, the young mind especially, is apt to throw dust in our eyes and prevent us from asking ourselves the disturbing and even frightening question, the more frightening the longer we burke it, whether in fact there is such a thing as Christian mysticism at all, and whether what passes under this name is nothing but a foreign import from Neo-Platonism.

Here, therefore, may I pay a belated tribute to a remarkable essay by Père Louis Bouyer, tucked away at the end of a small collection published by Blackfriars under the title *Mystery and Mysticism?* The essay is on the history of the word mysticism, and the result of close study of the new Lexicon of Patristic Greek still, I believe, in process of compilation under the joint direction of Dr F. L. Cross and Professor G. W. H. Lampe.

The essay establishes beyond all serious doubt that Christian mysticism can now be said to have a respectable history of its own, and to be no importation. This is not the place to summarize his argument. Suffice it to say he shows that the word mystical was taken over by Christian writers at a time when it had been virtually emptied of its original reference to the pagan mysteries, much as our word salvation has now been evacuated of all theological content for the multitudes, as when I speak of a taxi or a cup of tea as "my salvation". By the second century the word had been reduced to commonplace usage, so that Christianity was free to adopt and harness its own meaning on to it without fear of misunderstanding.

Dionysius the Areopagite, however, is the crux of the argument. Though Clement of Rome is the first to use the word mystical, it is Dionysius who regularizes it in his *Treatise on Mystical Theology* late in the fifth or early in the sixth century. Yet the prevalent assumptions of Neo-Platonic influence on his writings make it difficult and therefore all the more important to remember that while, as P. Bouyer says, the Bible is the least Greek thing about Christianity, for Dionysius it is Christ in his native setting of the liturgy and scriptures as their central jewel who is the object of his contemplation. The notion that he worked out his system of mystical theology under the direct influence of Plotinus is put almost out of court by the further consideration that the word μυστικός (*mustikos*) occurs not once in the *Enneads*, only the adverb μυστικῶς (*mustikōs*), and that in a non-mystical context.

I plead indulgence for this digression on the ground that it is something of a shock to discover a vast query frowning over years of reading and throwing their value into question. We may as well be as sure as we can as soon as we can that we are not setting out up a cul-de-sac. Life is short.

We come now to the proper subject of this essay, "the masters of the spiritual life, the classics of mystical and ascetical theology; where to start, and the best translations and editions".

1. Who are the masters of the spiritual life, and what are the classics of mystical and ascetical theology? There is a snare in both questions. First, there are indeed many masters of the spiritual life who have committed their priceless wisdom to writing. Yet it is possible to maintain that it can be positively injurious to model one's life upon any of them, especially in the artificial milieu of an English theological college. The danger in doing so is that we quickly master a technique of which we become immensely proud, only to find in too many cases that it has no cutting edge in the rough uncomprehending world outside. So many of the undoubted masters did not in fact write for our world or age, and even some of those who did and do appear to have written for a highly clericalized world abstracted from that to which we are sent. They too often provide us with a technique for dodging and manipulating rather than facing and conquering the raw material of crude circumstance. It is therefore generally better to have a living than a literary master, if only for the reason that literary masters are rarely masters at all,

but merely quarries from which we may pick what appeals to us. A living master, however, even if he is a hero only, and neither a novice master nor a spiritual director, can rebuke us when and where we need it, and make us feel the blast of Christ's mouth as few books can.

Secondly, what precisely do we mean by classics of mystical and ascetical theology? The snare here is that if we deliberately limit ourselves to the commonly accepted classics of these related fields, we shall almost certainly miss some of the finest, though occasional and incidental, mystical writing that Christendom has thrown up. My point is that avowedly doctrinal works frequently produce as much concentrated mystical or contemplative writing as those professedly devoted exclusively to the relation of contemplative experience. If doctrine is the formulation of fact and experience, then its explication must of necessity at times run over into genuinely contemplative or intuitive, i.e. mystical writing. Contemplative prayer is doctrine translated and made alive in terms of love and loving knowledge—notice how easily the first Article of our Religion turns itself into adoration—hence the best books for devotional reading are not always the purely devotional but doctrinal, since it is the impact of true doctrine on the mind that sets us musing on its implications, and so by feeding it at the deepest level causes it to blaze into life as it tastes its natural food, and slide imperceptibly into contemplation. That was the old method, as Fr Gerald Vann has pointed out. To much pure devotion on the other hand, i.e. doctrine already masticated by the author, if it is anything but first rate, the mind can only reply with a murmured Yes, and the soul remains unmoved. But more of this in a moment.

2. The Texts.

(*a*) *Bibliographies.* There are exhaustive bibliographies at the end of three modern anglican works, Evelyn Underhill's *Mysticism*, published in 1910 and revised in 1930 (Methuen); Bede Frost's *Art of Mental Prayer* (S.P.C.K. 1932), and Fr Hubert Northcott's *Venture of Prayer* (S.P.C.K. 1950). The first is the most comprehensive, including works of non-christian mysticism, with a long list of titles on the theology, psychology and philosophy of mysticism, giving publishers, dates, translators and important monographs on each classical author listed. This book also contains a most useful appendix in the form of an historical sketch of European mysticism from the beginning of the Christian era to the death of Blake.

The second suffers somewhat in being heavily weighted in a Roman direction, including many French authors. It contains no reference to poets, and stops at 1931. It does, however, provide the clearest details of prices (very much out of date) and publishers, and, A.A.-wise, has a system of asterisks to denote more important works. The last chapter of *The Art of Mental Prayer*, on the direction of souls, offers some excellent advice on the reading and lending of the great spiritual writers, which can be of much use to a priest in a parish, often having to convert as much by the books he loans as by his life and preaching.

The third would probably prove the least confusing to someone

new to the subject. Though smaller than the others, it has been chosen with much discrimination and carefully set out under headings such as "Schools of mystics", which help to reduce the sense of bewilderment and confusion in the early stages of study.

(*b*) *Poetry*. Evelyn Underhill unaccountably lists a mere handful of poets. There is no mention of Langland, Crashaw, Herbert, Traherne, Cowper, Browning, or Gerard Manley Hopkins, to cite the more obvious omissions. *The Oxford Book of Mystical Verse* would probably prove a good starting point here.

(*c*) *Doctrino-mystical Works*. I have already asserted at some length that much mystical theology of a high order is hidden away in the clefts of works ostensibly doctrinal, which yet deliberately or inadvertently are constantly overflowing by the mere force of spiritual logic and passion into genuinely contemplative writing. Philippians 2. 5–11 is a perfect example. A relatively commonplace injunction to cultivate the mind of Christ in his humiliation slides imperceptibly and is caught up into St Paul's unsurpassed vision of his final sovereignty. These are the times, when a Christian is off his guard, when the Spirit takes hold of him and makes him utter things he hardly knows till he has said them. And the process goes on. This is precisely the reason why so much of this type of mystical writing is and must be occasional. It cannot be conjured or turned on at will. There are passages buried under the mass of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* which would have made Augustine himself gasp, when that judicious man forgets his measured tread and lets the Spirit seize him. The same is liable to occur anywhere in Jeremy Taylor's writings except the *Ductor Dubitantium*; we seldom stop short of the reality of heaven or hell in Donne's sermons; at any moment the *Religio Medici* of Thomas Browne, *The Saints' Everlasting Rest*, *The Serious Call*, and even Bishop Pearson *On the Creed*, can sweep us like a whirlwind into heaven; and such diverse men as Scott Holland, Newman and Dr C. S. Lewis can do it too—all in the exposition of doctrine. It would be a pity, to say the least, to miss such treasures.

(*d*) *A few recent works*. Some of the titles below are of the doctrino-mystical variety distinguished above rather than strictly mystical, but the reader will be able to tell almost at a glance how to classify:

The Friendship of Christ. C. H. Smyth. (A Bishop of London's Lent Book: Longmans, 1945.) A warm golden book from an austere Christian mind.

The Mysteries of the Mass in Reasoned Prayers. Fr Roche, S.J. (Longmans, 1946.) The prayers here are in a strangely compelling blank verse.

D. L. Sayers' translation of Dante's Hell (1949) and Purgatorio (1955) in the Penguin Classics. Said to have not a word of poetry in it, but gets there nevertheless.

The works of Thomas Merton (published by Hollis and Carter): (e.g.) *Seeds of Contemplation; Waters of Silence; Elected Silence; The Ascent to Truth; The Last of the Fathers* (St Bernard).

The Mind and the Heart of Love. M. C. D'Arcy (Faber, recently reprinted.)

The Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne. I. Husain. (S.P.C.K., 1938.)

The Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius of Loyola. Ed. W. H. Longridge. (Mowbrays, new edition, 1950.)

For the contemplative life in action there is Fr Gerald Vann's *The Divine Pity* (Fontana Books), and in the same series, *The Diary of a Country Priest,* by Georges Bernanos.

Puritan Devotion. G. S. Wakefield. (Epworth, 1957.)

3. Where to start.

The ordinands who asked for this essay stated that this was their main problem. The answer is surely to read a few basic works on the nature of Christian mysticism, some of the more representative mystics themselves *in toto,* and then begin to find one's *métier,* remembering that one's tastes are always slowly changing.

(*a*) *General Works.* Evelyn Underhill's *Mysticism* is indispensable as an introduction to the whole subject. A more limited but more lucid, positive and mature work is that of Cuthbert Butler on *Western Mysticism* (Constable, 1926), which unfolds the teaching of St Augustine, St Gregory and St Bernard on contemplation. It is important, however, to read the Afterthoughts, which occur first in the book, last. For an understanding of the mutual interlocking of the institutional, intellectual, and mystical elements in religion the early chapters of Von Hügel's *Mystical Element of Religion* (Dent, 1927) is of permanent value. F. Heiler's *Prayer. A study in the History and Psychology of Religion* (O.U.P., 27s. 6d.) has just been reprinted and should not be neglected. Likewise a collection of Essays by a galaxy of Christian scholars, published in 1916 by Macmillan, entitled *Concerning Prayer,* will repay study. Much precious light has been thrown on the emergence of early Benedictine spirituality by the work of Dr Owen Chadwick in *John Cassian* (Cambridge, 1950), in which he unearths for us the vital links which bind Anthony to Benedict. Lastly, for applied spirituality, there is *The Art of Mental Prayer,* already mentioned, and the *Spiritual Letters of Dom John Chapman,* published by Sheed and Ward in the Hart Library (2nd enlarged Edn in 1944). The latter are likely to go down as some of the finest of their kind in the language. The *Letters of Evelyn Underhill* (Longmans, 1944) are valuable and more homely, but they lack the knife-edge, tensile quality of the others. As a companion to these it would be hard to find a better book than *The Divine Pity* (Fontana Series), just mentioned.

(*b*) *The Mystics Themselves.* The natural course would be to skim through the centuries, delving deeply into representative writers, and then retracing one's steps to fill in the gaps with the help of bibliographies. But in fact, unless we happen to be the equivalent of Von Hügel's niece, things hardly ever turn out like this. At any stage of our lives, particularly at theological colleges, pressures, problems and the providence of God are upon us, which upset such ordered schemes. Someone is always liable to say, "If you feel like this, you should read So-and-So," and we set off in mid-course on our friend's favourite remedy, and have to enlarge our bridgehead backwards

and forwards through history afterwards. But here is the kind of thing an intelligent angel might do, "looking into" these things in a purposeful, leisurely way.

The Bible is basic. Let this be clearly understood from the beginning. The mystics are not substitutes for scripture, though they are among the supreme revealers of it. The relevant volumes (I–IV) of the new Library of Christian Classics (S.C.M. Press) will provide a taste of early Patristic spirituality; Helen Waddell's *Desert Fathers* gives us an unforgettable impression of the impact of St Anthony; and a dip into Cassian's Conferences and Institutes will help us to see St Benedict in the right perspective.

Some four years before Cassian Augustine died. There are various good translations of his *Confessions*; Prof. Burnaby's *Amor Dei* (Hodder and Stoughton, reprinted 1947), is an essential companion to his writings. and there is a very valuable collection of extracts from his writings in *An Augustine Synthesis*, compiled by Erich Przywara, S.J. (Sheed and Ward, 1945).

Dionysius the Areopagite is a turning point in so far as he introduces the negative way into Christian thought. (For texts see E. Underhill's Bibliography). St Bernard's Sermons, the Love of God, and *De Consideratione*, might be the next call; one might spend a lifetime on St Thomas or Dante; and Volume XIII of the Library of Christian Classics will open peep-holes and furnish us with a jumping-off ground into the treasures of late medieval mysticism, particularly the Victorines, St Francis, Bonaventure, Lull, Eckhart, Catherine of Siena, Ruysbroeck, the Theologia Germanica, and Nicholas of Cusa.

The English mystics of the fourteenth century, Rolle, Hilton, the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, and Lady Julian, deserve to be read in full, for there is nothing in the world quite like them. From these we might pass to *The Imitation*, St John of the Cross (St Teresa can be left until later), St Francis de Sales and Augustine Baker. A year spent exclusively with any one of these is sufficient to mould the mind for life. The same may be said of De Caussade's treatise *On Prayer* and his Letters (*Abandonment to Divine Providence*. The Catholic Records Press, Exeter), as also of Baxter and Law. It may perhaps be well to enter a word of caution here about sixteenth and post-sixteenth century writings. They tend to measure progress by inner spiritual states rather than by "paradaisal power", to use a phrase of Fr D'Arcy.

In the last century the greater part of English mystical thought found expression in verse, Wordsworth, Newman, Browning, and Hopkins, etc., though much can be found hidden in the vast wealth of Westcott and the whole *Lux Mundi* School, Church's Sermons, Paget's *Spirit of Discipline* (Longmans, 1891), and in our own day Von Hügel's *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion* (Dent). It is indeed "good measure, pressed down, and running over".

4. Where to stop.

The great mystical writers are a means and not an end. They must

decrease if Christ is to have his proper increase, and we a spiritual life authentically our own. When a man finds himself reading them for a hobby, therefore, and no longer for food and discipline, then is the time to stop and learn again where our centre is.

J. K. Byrom.

John Middleton Murry

Harnack, Schweitzer, Barth, Bultmann are outstanding names in the Protestant theology of the past century. Among them, only Barth remains to a large extent within the Christian dogmatic tradition. Yet all of them, though they gave widely different answers to the question which formed the title of Harnack's most famous book, would regard themselves as in some sense Christians and on the scale of world history would be regarded as such by others. For John Middleton Murry, a layman moving in quite other circles than those of professional theology, the same crucial question, *What is Christianity?* was the central and absorbing concern of most of his adult life.

This concern was not academic or professional. He did not start from the Christian faith. He was forced to engage himself with it by a wide-ranging experience of life. He was in his young days one of the foremost literary critics of his time. His founding of *The Adelphi* in 1923 was the expression of a faith that "life is important and that more life should be man's chief endeavour", and he hoped to include among its contributors three types of people—first, the writers "who give us life, who have what Matthew Arnold called "magic of style", the strange power of communicating life to us direct, of sharpening our vision, of awakening our imagination, of delighting and satisfying our souls with an apprehension of new truth; secondly, the men of science, and thirdly, the true humanists, the moralists, "who try to express through the written word their conviction that man's conduct of life is his most pressing concern".

But Murry's experience of life was by no means confined to the world of literature. He was for a time an active member of the Labour Party, and during the Second World War was the acknowledged leader of the pacifist movement. He had in this way a first-hand experience of the world of politics. He was a practical and successful farmer. In his personal life he drank deeply of the cup of suffering. His first wife was the victim of tuberculosis, as was also his second, and both deserted him before the end. His own neuroticism may have contributed to the tragedies. His third wife was mentally unbalanced, and made his home a hell. It was only in his last years that he found domestic peace and calm. What he endured gives depth to everything that he says.

Not only was the range of Murry's experience unusually wide, but he himself was in an exceptional degree an "experiencing nature"; this gift was his by birth, but it was one which he never ceased to cultivate. With him, as with Keats, everything had to be proved on

his pulses. Whenever an idea took hold of him, it had at once to be translated into action.

Because of this engagement with life, it was always the central concerns of Christian faith, God and Christ, on which his attention was unswervingly fixed. Before he was forty he had written a book about each. In the more than fifty talks included in *Not as the Scribes*[1] it was nearly always one of these themes that was the core of the address. What Murry had to say was always the same thing—that the meaning of each was Love.

Mr Lea was given the chance of writing the life of a highly interesting human being, and he has made the most of it. The 350 pages of his book[2] hold the reader's attention from beginning to end. He had at his disposal a superabundance of material; Murry's more than forty published works are only a tenth, we are told, of his surviving output. Almost everything that Murry wrote was self-revelatory, and one of his fundamental virtues was an unsparing honesty about himself. All was without reserve confided to his Journal. His biographer has made no attempt to present an idealized portrait; Murry's shortcomings are recorded with the same candour as his virtues.

Mr Lea has chosen wisely to present Murry primarily as "moralist", that is, as one whose life was a quest for values and the criterion of whose criticism was "a determination of what was good for man". The consistency of this quest and criterion is the explanation of the contradictions and inconsistencies of his life and thought. He was for years the leading pacifist in England, and later renounced his pacifism. He wrote a book on *The Necessity of Communism* and was in later years ready to endorse a preventive war against Communism. Similarly startling inconsistencies may be found in his theological thinking, as it finds expression in *Not as the Scribes* and in his final treatment of the main theme of his life in *Love, Freedom and Society*, published in 1957. These glaring contradictions might incline one to turn aside from Murry as a man who did not know his own mind about anything. He perhaps carried to excess Keats' advice (one of Murry's most frequent quotations) to "let the mind be a thoroughfare for all thought". But it is precisely his inconsistencies that give to Murry's life and thought a peculiar interest. Life *is* made up of contraries, some of them irreconcilable, and Murry as an "experiencing nature" was more aware of them than most of us. "The only truth I know," he wrote, "which does possess a real finality, is that which impresses upon men the necessity of a continual self-annihilation; that is to say, a continual surrender of the finality of one's own truth." He was, moreover, not only a deeply experiencing but also an experimental man. He could not see a truth without at once committing himself to it and submitting it to the test and correction of experience. Such a man, as Mr Lea says, is bound to make headlong mistakes, and Murry made more than his full share.

[1] Lay sermons by John Middleton Murry. Introduction by Alec R. Vidler. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 18s.

[2] *John Middleton Murry*. By F. A. Lea. Methuen. 1959. 30s.

Dr Vidler has done a real service in making available to a wider circle a collection of the addresses which Murry was in the habit of giving at services on Sunday evenings to the small community on his farm. Books of sermons are not to everyone's taste. This collection, for one reader at least, is a notable exception. One feels that one is listening to a man sharing his deepest experiences with his friends. Incidentally the talks shed light at many points on the process of learning, as Murry was convinced we all must slowly and patiently *learn*, what it means to live in love with our fellow-men.

Hardly anything is more surprising today than the ease and complacency with which nearly all Christian utterances, spoken and written, use the word God as though it bore for everyone an intelligible meaning. The plain truth is that for the overwhelming majority of educated men and women in the world today the term has either lost all meaning whatsoever, or conveys a false meaning. Murry was haunted and tormented by the problem throughout his life. In his treatment of it we encounter the inconsistencies that are inseparable from his determination to do justice to every element in experience. He confessed that the statement that God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son was in essence "the profoundest statement of the most important truth that is ever given to men to know". But he found it increasingly impossible to reconcile this truth with what we know of the world today. For the fifteen hundred years in which Christianity established itself in Europe the universe was a small place, with the earth set solidly at its centre. In this homely, almost cosy, universe it was not too difficult to believe that the God whom Christ revealed also created and controlled the world. But the creation of the galaxies is something which the imagination cannot grasp; when we affirm it, we do not know what we are saying. The human universe which Christianity postulates and declares "is no longer an intellectual possibility for us. Expanded illimitably by astronomy, by geology, by anthropology, by prehistory, by archaeology, by our knowledge of other civilizations, the universe cannot be gathered into the arms of a Father's love." The conditions of the actual world forbid us to give ontological status to the world of spirit. Murry accepted that conclusion without demur. He was content with the experienced reality of love.

For Murry Jesus was the man who obeyed Love to the bitter end, who revealed its illimitable depths, who set to work in history the power of Love to withstand the love of Power. Jesus had introduced into the world a new dimension of experience. So overwhelming did this revelation seem to Murry that he felt at times that no language was adequate to express it except the language of Christian orthodoxy. "The nearest I can get to a conviction of transcendent truth," he once wrote to T. S. Eliot, "is through the contemplation of the life and death of our Lord." If the truth were told, he wrote on another occasion, Jesus was a great deal more real to him than anybody he had known in the flesh. Murry's life was ruled by "some high and certain knowledge that in the utter disaster of the bravest and most beautiful soul that has visited this earth is the supreme

revelation of the beauty and purpose of life". Though he at one time thought seriously of taking orders, Murry was very far from being an orthodox Christian; he also lacked some of the conventional virtues. But one is constrained to think of him as a man on whom Jesus might have pronounced the same judgment that he did on the woman who anointed him with the alabaster flask of ointment, that he "loved much".

If the revelation of Jesus was the revelation of love, if in Jesus "new being" had appeared in the world, then for Murry there could be no choice but to obey that revelation. "Jesus created a new world, sustained by a new contact between man and God, and the real history of man is his effort to realize this new world. That is the meaning of human history." To that effort of transforming human life Murry wholly dedicated himself. It is the explanation of his adoption, and in the light of experience, subsequent rejection of communism and pacifism, and of his passionate advocacy of the "free society" as a partial and progressive embodiment in history of Jesus' teaching about love. It was the inspiration of his attempt to form a community which would learn in practice what the new way of life meant, and work out in miniature a pattern for a new society. Love, he held, needed a lot of learning. The same preoccupation with love was the source of his effort to relate in thought and practice sacred and profane love between man and woman.

Nearly all these endeavours ended in apparent failure. But the disappointments and frustrations by which they were attended open up a wide range of stimulating ideas. His experimental life was Murry's legacy to succeeding generations. His judgments were often mistaken, and his actions often perverse. But the goals which he set before himself are a perpetual challenge, and his experience in the pursuit of them rich in instruction. His friend, Max Plowman, was not far off the mark when he said, "Though he's never right, he will never be wrong—Murry is the most valuable man alive."

J. H. Oldham.

An Experiment in Lincolnshire

The tenor of recent articles and correspondence suggests that the necessary administrative machinery to deal with the present situation in the countryside does not exist. This is not so, and my purpose is to show that, without resorting to expediency, a method of country work has been established which not merely meets the needs of the situation but actually provides a pattern which can reinvigorate clergy and laypeople alike by giving them a wider sense of fellowship and purpose than is possible in a state of isolation.

I have no doubt that there have been other experiments of which I am unaware, but the largest grouping of small country parishes is in the Lincolnshire Wolds and has been in existence since 1949. Some short account of its history may be of value to those who are

seeking guidance in the new approach to the work of the Church in the countryside.

The diocese of Lincoln, being mainly rural with a preponderance of very small country parishes, was, not unnaturally, very early concerned with Pastoral Reorganization, and anticipated the measure by making a thorough survey of the diocese and its needs. The findings were published in a small booklet called "No Secret Plan". The suggested groupings were available for all to see, and among the suggestions made there was one that urged an experimental grouping of small parishes on a large scale. This soon became known as the South Ormsby Group and comprised South Ormsby, Ketsby, Calceby, Driby; Harrington, Brinkhill; Somersby, Bag Enderby; Tetford, Salmonby; Oxcombe, Ruckland, Farforth, Maidenwell and the Chapel of Ease of Worlaby—fifteen ecclesiastical parishes with twelve churches which were formerly managed by six incumbents. The interesting point about this particular grouping is that the people themselves requested the Bishop to group them together under the leadership of the Rector of South Ormsby.

The grouping has, of necessity, been brought about in stages because three of the incumbents were still in office, so that the original group was made up of six churches only, which were managed by a staff of two. Now that the group has reached its anticipated size, the staff consists of the Rector, a priest, a deacon, a deaconess (soon unfortunately to leave through ill health), and an hon. lay reader who is headmaster of the local grammar school. A priest is also attached to the staff for training purposes for a year while being priest-in-charge of two small adjoining parishes.

The curates are married and live in two Rectories which are three miles apart, the other houses having been sold and the proceeds added to the Group Stipend Fund. Since the curates are thus spaced out, they have the oversight of the churches originally in the hands of single-handed incumbents, and the parishioners regard them as their own spiritual heads in the ordinary working of parish life. But the gain in fellowship of worship and work is of incalculable value both to the leader of the group and the curates. The team meet at the churches in turn for Mattins, Holy Communion and Meditation on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and breakfast together afterwards in each others' houses. This is also the routine on Red Letter Saints' Days. All the work is shared, and each one knows what problems exist in each parish by this constant meeting together. The Staff Meeting each Monday is a full one, covering the past week's work and planning for the future. The training of the curates is perhaps the most important aspect of this new system of country work done by grouping parsons and parishes. The curates have time to deal with individuals; learn the art of pastoralia in ideal conditions; have time to read and generally build up their spiritual and intellectual reserves, which are vital and necessary for a long and inspired ministry wherever they may be called to serve.

That they gain some insight into the new method of country work and the administrative experience of caring for several parishes

must be of the greatest value, for their future role in the church at large.

But there is a further application of this training principle, for although many men trained in such a group will not necessarily remain country parsons all their lives—though to be sure some will in the process of training find a vocation to the rural ministry—they will, if they return to the countryside after a ministry in the busier streams of life, at any rate be *au fait* with the country people and their way of life. There would thus be less frustration for the parson and less disappointment for the people.

A word about the role of the laity ought to be added before I sum up the opportunities there are in this new pastoral method. It has been found that where parishes are so grouped, the parishioners have a far larger part to play in church life, for a good deal more of the day-to-day management of church affairs devolves upon the laity. They have also, in many instances, been brought to see that they share, too, in the training of the younger men who remain for three years. The unifying factor is the Rector of the Group, who must be prepared to remain long enough to "belong" to the larger community. The general management of the group is vested in the churchwarden's and sidesmen's meeting, which is called from time to time when policy is discussed and ideas pooled. The findings and recommendations are then filtered through to the various parishes by the responsible officials. The ordinary day to day problems of the individual parishes are dealt with through the usual Parochial Church Council meetings which are called as occasion requires, and, since the curates often chair such meetings, they gain experience which will be of value when they become incumbents in their own right.

People ask about the services and are surprised to find that no church has been closed—indeed, most of them have been restored since the group began to function—and it is possible for everyone to attend Holy Communion, Mattins and Evensong on any given Sunday without undue inconvenience. The parish bus—a 29-seater Bedford, which the group owns and operates—tours the parishes each Sunday morning to fetch the young to Junior Church Service, at which a set course of instruction is given; there is an afternoon Sunday School run on conventional lines at the largest village, and in the evening the parish bus is again used to transport parishioners and the area choir to the churches in turn for what has become known as Bus Evensong. The total number of services for the group on an average Sunday would be four celebrations of Holy Communion; two morning services—either Mattins or Sung Eucharist; three afternoon services and three Evensongs, including Bus Evensong. The method of using modern forms of transport like the bus has meant better and far more inspiring services than were possible formerly, for there are also occasions when the main service is held at the mother church, when all the parishes combine. The parishes have been fused into a wider family instead of remaining small and ineffective units. Moreover, far from causing dissension, there has

grown up a friendly, healthy rivalry and genuine interest in each other; a desire to help each other at all levels, even to the extent of sharing proceeds of some money-raising effort, and the virtual disappearance of the narrow, self-centred parochialism so often present in small village communities.

It is certainly true that where a team of clergy are so engaged in this new pattern of country work, the benefits for clergy and people are most marked. There is a sense of purpose and direction not readily noticed in isolated country cures. Indeed, the church does come alive.

It so happens that for a year four of the other churches in the Rural Deanery came under the care of the group, owing to two sequestrations, and, as Rural Dean, it was my duty to provide for the services, visiting and general management of the parishes. With the aid of a monthly News Letter, the occasional inter-parish visits made possible by the parish bus, and the already known and accepted pattern of working parishes in groups, the temporarily attached parishes gained some of the new sense of purpose and wider fellowship, while the people of the South Ormsby group of parishes in turn experienced a sense of mission and responsibility for an even wider family than their own.

Perhaps it is due to this that the pattern of the Deanery has greatly changed; for whereas in the past little was done to make the Deanery an active, worshipping and administrative unit, the clergy now meet monthly in each parish in turn for Mattins and Holy Communion, followed by breakfast together, and the morning is spent in discussing Diocesan, Deanery and Parish matters, and it is seldom that some aspect of the life of the church is not discussed. Social activities, too, play a part, and the clergy in the Deanery now have a stronger sense of fellowship and a common purpose which was formerly lacking.

The scope of an article such as this is far too small to indicate all the possibilities of such methods of grouping country parishes, but I do know that two books on the subject will soon be available, and we must wait for them to supply what is lacking here.

I might sum up, therefore, by saying that the advantages of grouping parsons and parishes are so marked, and the situation so urgent, that the Bishops and others whose duty and privilege it is to make appointments should make a close study of the rural ministry a top priority, with the added determination to act and plan boldly. The advantages are obvious. The new system saves both manpower and money, and both are serious considerations today. The clergy, instead of being isolated and spiritually lonely, find a new and inspiring fellowship of worship and work. This in turn is passed on to the people, who respond to an active and happy ministry. The training so urgently needed by younger men becomes an actual extension of their Theological College training and builds up the spiritual and intellectual resources for their future work. Thus the whole church benefits from this by having men more capable of meeting all the strains and stresses of a busy ministry. The people are as well, and in some cases better, cared for pastorally; and since more and more

devolves upon the laity, the newly found sense of responsibility brings about a more dedicated lay apostolate, as they take their part in the actual life and worship of the Church. Narrow parochialism is broken down and a wider and more Christian spirit is engendered —indeed, the grouping of parishes and parsons really works.

A. C. Smith.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr White is an assistant master at Wellington College.

The Rev. J. K. Byrom is Vicar of Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire.

Dr Oldham edited from 1939 to 1945 *The Christian News-Letter*, to which Mr Murry was a contributor.

The Rev. A. C. Smith is Rector of the South Ormsby Group of Parishes.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE GOSPEL LECTION IN THE RITE OF INFANT BAPTISM

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

One of the chief claims of the Church of England today is that its teaching is firmly based on sound scholarship and especially on a scholarly understanding of the Bible. If as a lay person one tries to instruct oneself in this, one of the first things one learns is that there are certain texts which may be very edifying in themselves but which cannot be relied on as authentic utterances of the Lord. I have always understood that Matthew 28. 18–20, with its explicit use of the Trinitarian formula at this early stage, is one of these. If this is so it seems a fatal mistake to insert it in a conspicuous position in the Baptism service. The impression will certainly be given that the Church is confident that Jesus Christ spoke these very words to his disciples; and if this impression is misleading it is a serious matter. People will build their ideas on it, and they will be building upon sand. It is this kind of thing which should be eliminated from our services, not put into them. To fail to admit what is unreliable or untrue is one of the most certain ways of failing to establish what is reliable and true. It is more important for any form of service to be scholarly in the sense that its teaching is to be trusted than for it to be "fully in accord with primitive practice and sound liturgical principles";[1] or rather, for it to be

[1] C. E. Pocknee, Theology, December 1959, p. 499.

scholarly in this sense surely deserves to be one of the most important of all liturgical principles.

Yours faithfully,
L. H. Oppenheimer.

10 Northmoor Road,
Oxford.

SIN AND INFANT BAPTISM

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

It is surely a commonplace of theological textbooks to prefer the term "original guilt" to "original sin", and I found it a little extraordinary that Mr Bezzant should labour the point so heavily. But how clearly the sort of thinking that is behind the movement for Baptismal Reform emerges from his article! Nothing less, in fact, than the complete abandonment of the Catholic doctrine on "scientific" grounds. "There is not," he says, "a shred of evidence that man was ever perfect, free from sin, disease, and death . . . the notion would have vanished . . . had it not been believed to be guaranteed by divinely revealed information." This, surely, is a most unscientific argument from silence (for there is certainly no evidence the other way), and he proceeds to draw conclusions aimed at the heart of the Catholic doctrine which his Church is pledged to disseminate. Is it not true besides that other "notions" such as the Virgin Birth, the Incarnation, the Atonement, etc., would also have vanished did we not believe them to be guaranteed by divinely revealed information? Where, indeed, do we stop?

". . . we must choose between the biblical and the modern scientific stories of the early history of mankind . . ." might be true if we were mere historians. As theologians, however, are we not bound to dredge from the folk-lore of the People of God the residue of revealed religious truth? The first fact that might bid us be careful is the use by our Lord of the story of Adam and Eve in the earliest Gospel. Mr Bezzant, secondly, himself admits the innate character of individual and societary lawlessness, and does not make Waterhouse's mistake of declaring that mental characteristics cannot "scientifically" be inherited. Thirdly, to argue from the feelings of modern Christians is surely unsound. Few of us, indeed and alas, feel the fearsome and tragic nature of sin, but that it *is* both fearsome and tragic every tenet of our Faith as well as human history surely show. Lastly, with regard to death, it is a fact that the human body corrupts, and that the only Sinless Body of which we have historical knowledge did not do so.

Those who accept the *ex opere operato* doctrine of baptismal grace, while they would deplore the refusal to baptize any infant in a country where there is still a large residue of *undifferentiated* Christianity and where some Christian teaching is given in every school, have never, as Mr Bezzant must know, anywhere maintained

that "nothing can justify refusal to baptize if baptism is asked for or desired". But a complex of scientific opinion and logical analysis based on its shifting hypotheses is a flimsy ground for denying our children their Catholic heritage. Manifestly, on his own showing, the doctrine of the Church of England is the received Catholic doctrine. Does the teaching of the Church as far back as the records go signify nothing? Despite his disclaimers one cannot but feel that the ghost of Pelagius is still unlaid in his own country.

Yours faithfully,

HUGH LEVINGE.

ROYAL NAVAL AIR STATION,
BRAWDY, PEMBROKESHIRE.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I am impressed by the searchingly honest and fearless article by the Rev. J. S. Bezzant on "Sin and Infant Baptism" in THEOLOGY for November. I am disturbed, however, at a serious mis-statement he makes in his remarks about the psychological basis of that "tendency to lawlessness" which we find already present when moral consciousness is attained.

He writes that this condition "being prior to self-consciousness, is *manifestly inherited* . . ." (my italics): this does not follow. It is known that impressions, ideas, tendencies to action and so on can be assimilated below the level of consciousness and, although remaining at a subconscious level, provide motivating influences in behaviour. There is also no small amount of evidence to show that the infant organism, even at the pre-natal stage, assimilates environmental influences which can condition later behaviour—e.g., when self-consciousness appears.

There is, therefore, no easy way of determining whether any "lawless" behaviour which appears spontaneously with or before the dawn of moral consciousness is due to inherited or acquired tendencies.

The relationship between "heredity" and "environment" is extremely complex and we have to be very careful in saying what we mean by "inherited". For example, a child has a mental defect with which it was born. Inherited? It all depends. Is it the result of a defective gene, or genes or some permutation thereof? Or is it the result of a defective environment in the womb or of temporary suffocation of the infant during the birth-process?

The only certainty is that a child is born into a "tainted" environment and, willy-nilly, absorbs tendencies to err: so Mr Bezzant's argument and its conclusion remain valid—but let us get our psychological facts and our language right.

Yours faithfully,

ARTHUR WATLING.

39 ORWELL STREET,
MIDDLESBROUGH.

ELDERS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It was with deep misgivings that I read the letter in your November issue from the Rev. C. M. Ballard. One of the basic faults with the Joint Report on Anglican and Presbyterian relations was that terms were used which had different meanings to each church. Your correspondent has, I feel, fallen into this trap.

There may well be a strong case for giving the laity a much larger part in the official life of the Church of England. But to associate a few laymen in each parish with the work of the clergy is not an eldership. Even if they be given some pastoral responsibility, it still remains a mockery of the Presbyterian system. We must never forget that the Presbyterian elder not only has responsibility, but he has real power and authority as well.

The Church of England could well benefit from a proper examination of the eldership. But do not forget that the eldership is incompatible with the present legal and administrative system in England. There are many difficult questions to be thought about before any gesture could be made. What is the true power of the elders? Are they in any sense "ordained"? If they are ordained, how and by whom? Can there be women elders? What is the elders' true function with regard to the sacrament of Holy Communion?

Any gesture not based upon considered answers to these questions would be either impossible or too unlike the Presbyterian eldership to have any meaning.

The rejection of the Joint Report was no surprise to anyone in Scotland. But the discussion over it has raised certain questions. We Anglicans must consider not only the eldership, but also those questions asked of us by the General Assembly this year. But the Presbyterians must in particular find out what they mean by Reunion, and if they really want it. The barriers to Reunion in Scotland are very much at the parish level.

Yours faithfully,
DAVID G. S. BATTERSBY.

14 LOCHLEA ROAD,
NEWLANDS,
GLASGOW, S.3.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Dr Mascall thinks he is arguing against me, but I do not think I am arguing against him. I agree with nearly all that he says in his letter.

I am shocked, however, to find that he apparently thinks me capable of advocating reunion through a series of expedient concessions rather than through agreement in the truth. Bishop Palmer, of South India fame, used to say, "Let us have no concessions but

convictions all round." I stand by that, and I add that we must always be ready to re-examine our own convictions in the light of other people's convictions.

If theological argument took place in a vacuum there might not be much to add to what Dr Mascall says, but racial memories, prejudices and other "non-theological factors" affect relations between Anglicans and Presbyterians as much as the strict theological arguments. In my view the members of the Church Courts of the Church of Scotland never really came to grips with episcopacy, partly for reasons given by Dr Mascall, but partly for other reasons.

I agree that episcopacy and the eldership do not play equivalent roles in church order, but that was not my point. I was born obstinate; so were the Scots; if there is any mitigation of this quality in me or in them, that is the work of Grace. But I find that if a man will listen to me, I am more ready to listen to him. I conclude that if we Anglicans pocketed our pride—and it is pride—and "took the eldership seriously", as our Bishops have told us to do, then the Church of Scotland might "take a fresh look at Episcopacy".

Quite apart from this, I have come to believe that the principles underlying the eldership are valid for us too and that they have immense pastoral importance, though it is not easy to see precisely how they should be applied in our parish system.

In my experience, the idea of the eldership—though not the name—appeals strongly to Anglicans of all schools when it is explained by a Presbyterian minister or layman who sees the matter in pastoral terms.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN LAWRENCE.

59 BRYANSTON STREET,
LONDON, W.1.

"AUTHOR OF LIFE DIVINE"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In his review of *Eighteenth Century Church and People*, by S. C. Carpenter, your reviewer, Michael Hennell, makes the statement that "*Author of Life Divine* is wrongly attributed to Charles Wesley; John was the author". I would be glad to know on what grounds he makes this statement. When originally published, in "Hymns on the Lord's Supper" (1745), it was not attributed to either of the brothers, who, it is believed, agreed to publish jointly, making no distinction between which hymns were whose. In actual fact the majority of the hymns were by Charles Wesley, and in subsequent Methodist Hymn Books the distinction between the work of John and Charles Wesley has been made, wherever possible. In the case of this particular hymn all the books attribute it to Charles. Has your reviewer any grounds for "correcting" Dr Carpenter?

Yours faithfully,

FRANK T. FOX.

71 EASTERLY ROAD,
LEEDS, 8.

Mr Hennell writes:

"Obviously Dr Carpenter and Mr Fox are right and I am wrong. I apologize. In the Anglican Hymn Books which I habitually use, including *A. and M. Revised* 1950, the hymn is attributed to John Wesley. I had assumed that the A. and M. Committee had checked their references—evidently they had not. I have since discovered that there are wide discrepancies in the matter between *Songs of Praise* (where the hymn is attributed to Charles and John Wesley), and *English Hymnal* (to Charles), and *A. and M.* (to John). There is certainly something to be said for Methodist efficiency and uniformity."

UNDENOMINATIONAL RECTITUDE?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

May I be allowed to make a correction of Mr Hugh Montefiore's statement in his review in your December issue (p. 156) to the effect that the Theological Schools in the Modern Universities must walk "delicately with undenominational rectitude" along the path of historical theology to the exclusion of dogmatics? Of certain older Schools this statement may be true, but it is untrue of some newer ones. We are explicitly interdenominational or ecumenical, which is the exact opposite of "undenominational", and dogmatic theology is an integral part of our Honours course. May I briefly remind your readers of my article in your issue of March 1958, which apparently has escaped Mr Montefiore's notice?

Yours faithfully,
ALAN RICHARDSON.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM.

BOOK REVIEWS

MODERN CATHOLICISM. By Walther von Loewenich. Translated by R. H. Fuller. Macmillan, 1959. 50s.

This remarkably fair and dispassionate discussion by a Lutheran scholar, Professor of Protestant Church History at Erlangen University, is well calculated to make Anglican readers think. The author has no polemical purpose; he is not writing an attack nor a Dissuasive, not even a friendly appeal directed towards Roman Catholics. His intention is to discuss from the point of view of a convinced Lutheran who is nevertheless sympathetic towards Romanism the phenomenon which the modern Roman Catholic Church presents. In the course of this discussion he gives his own account of the forces which have made that church what it is today. His account will be accepted by non-Roman Catholics as a just and balanced one, and even Roman Catholics will have to agree that he is trying to be fair.

He makes a number of penetrating suggestions about the motives which have lain behind the (historically speaking) sudden efflorescence of new Roman dogmas within the last hundred years—a subject upon which it is very difficult to find clear guidance. When he comes to deal with the relation between the empirical church and the Body of Christ, and with the relation of faith to dogma, the Anglican reader will find a clarity and an insight which is badly needed in contemporary Anglican thought upon these subjects. Dr von Loewenich can criticize the Roman Catholic answers convincingly, but he never fails to look critically at the stock Lutheran answers too, and he compels his readers to search their hearts as they look at their own tradition in the light of his discussion. Those who buy this book will find in it not only a storehouse of information about contemporary Roman Catholicism but also a reminder of the sort of questions which they ought to be asking themselves now.

As one reads the book a number of detached impressions remain in the mind. One is of the eminence of the late Pope Pius XII. The reader may judge him severely as a wanton propagator of Marian dogma and the Marian cult, but his talent and indeed brilliance cannot be denied. He enabled his church to execute a *volte-face* from the impossible position on the subject of Scripture into which Pius X had led her; his Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* was a valuable contribution to Roman Catholic theology of the church; he was able to some extent to sympathize with modern scientific thought and with some of the most radical movements within Roman Catholicism. Another sensation which the reader will derive from this book is perhaps one of relief as he reads chapter seven on Mariology and Marian Devotion. Contemporary Protestantism exhibits flagrant enough examples of drivelling nonsense in such phenomena as the Witnesses of Jehovah and the Latter-Day Saints, but nothing could be more flagrant than the nonsense which is allowed to pass muster under the aegis of the cult of Our Lady of Fatima in the contemporary Roman Church.

But though the Anglican reader will find much to learn in this book, he will also find something lacking. The author is a German who writes almost entirely for a German public. He appears to know virtually nothing of Anglicanism. He deals far too slightly with Newman who, when all is said and done, was a great theologian. He wrongly imagines (pp. 66-7) that George Tyrrell was a convert from the Church of England. Tyrrell knew the Church of England only through a two-months' experience of extreme Anglo-Catholicism in London in 1879; had he known it from the inside, his career might have been very different. Dr von Loewenich's appreciation of the relation of Scripture to tradition is inadequate; it is not enough to quote a Lutheran distinction between *norma normans* and *norma normata* (p. 141). He writes like a man who has never sung the Te Deum nor used the Nicene Creed in the liturgy. This only goes to show how great the need is still that Lutherans and Anglicans should meet each other and understand each other more fully.

There are one or two minor mistakes to be detected; the Gelasian Decree can hardly (p. 162) be attributed to the first half of the *fifth* century. Pope Pius XII was not *consecrated* to the bishoprick of Rome (p. 219), because he was already (as the book earlier recognizes) bishop of Sardes.

R. P. C. Hanson.

University of Nottingham.

L'Eucharistie. Memorial du Seigneur. Sacrifice d'Action de Grace et d'Intercession. By Max Thurian. Delachaux et Niestlé. Frs 8.50.

After reading Max Thurian on Confession, on Marriage and Celibacy, and on Confirmation, one expected something really good from him on the Eucharist, but not anything quite so good as this. In 278 pages he reviews the background of the Eucharist in the theological and liturgical tradition of the Old Testament and the fulfilment of that tradition in the thought and practice of the Christian Church. He writes primarily as a biblical and liturgical theologian, but he takes into account the different dogmatic traditions which have developed in Christendom both before and after the Reformation. As a member of the Reformed Church he is naturally affected by the Calvinism in which he has been brought up. But by returning to Calvin he transcends the later Calvinist positions, and by exercising a deep and ecumenical charity he succeeds in producing a truly eirenic book.

In the first half he deals with the meaning of the word *Memorial* in the Old Testament—in connexion with the Feast of the Passover, with the Sacrificial Cultus of the Old Covenant and its liturgical setting, and with Prayer and Intercession. In the second half he examines the New Testament against this background, deals at some length with the Words attributed to the Lord at the Last Supper, and concludes with a chapter on the Eucharistic Sacrifice and another on the Eucharistic Presence. His exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as asserting at once the uniqueness of the Sacrifice of the Christ and its perpetuation in the heavenly intercession of the Great High Priest, is particularly interesting.

In the analysis of liturgical forms there seems to be some confusion in the author's mind between the respective functions of *eucharistia* and *anamnesis* in a Eucharistic Prayer. The Eucharistia, being the great thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption, should include references at some length to the mysteries of the Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection and Ascension. The Anamnesis, being simply an amplification of the words "Do this in remembrance of me" at the offering of the Bread and Cup, should be no more than a brief recalling of the dying and rising, which is the heart of the Redemption. Otherwise the Anamnesis would become a repetition of the Eucharistia. Theologically speaking, no doubt *eucharistia* is an integral part of the making of *anamnesis*. But, liturgically speaking,

the Eucharistia is one section of the Prayer and the Anamnesis is another.

In the matter of the Fraction the author follows the Calvinist tradition, and sees in it the symbol of the immolation of the Christ, but desires a second fraction to express the Pauline meaning of the sharing of the one loaf. As a parallel to the Fraction of the Bread he naturally wishes to include a Pouring out of the Wine, to symbolize the effusion of the Lord's Blood. Since such an outpouring can only take place at the Offertory, he is committed to a very strange liturgical pattern. First the immolation is symbolized by the pouring of the wine into the chalice at the Offertory, then the memorial is effected by means of the Thanksgiving over Bread and Cup, and then the immolation is again symbolized by the breaking of the Bread. It might perhaps be wiser if he were to abandon such a symbolism, which has in the past been connected with much bad theology and unhealthy devotion, and to be content with the Pauline symbolism of the Fraction—the one loaf being shared among the many, who form the one Body of Christ.

A. H. Couratin.

St Stephen's House,
Oxford.

The Life and Work of Edmund Bishop. By Nigel Abercrombie. Longmans. 1959. 70s.

Many Anglican students of theology remember Bishop, if at all, only as the joint author with Cardinal Gasquet of *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (1890). Those engaged in liturgical studies will know that in a number of articles, "notes and observations", "comments and memoranda", between 1903 and 1914, he effected a revolution in their entire direction, with results that are now felt far outside the field of liturgy. Those who have the good fortune to live with a copy of *Liturgica Historica* will know why. To read one of the papers in this is to be involved in what seems like a long conversation with a learned, humble, and candid friend, who leads you from place to place in your own and in other libraries, asking you fresh questions, and leaves you with these and your original question still unanswered, but full of gratitude for the communication and renewal of passion for the first-hand. To those who are willing to learn by this way he, being dead, speaks as no other scholar does. In some other sense than that of Mr Abercrombie's moving last chapter he is "free among the dead". To these this book will be a guide to new labours and new delights. The bibliography alone, containing not only Bishop's published writings, but a list of those to which he contributed material, is quite invaluable. But the book has a more general usefulness, which it is hard to specify briefly.

First of all it provides detailed documentation from notebooks and letters on the spiritual history of a scholar who became a

Roman Catholic for an opposite reason to most, if not all, the Oxford men. Bishop found in Acton's *Home and Foreign Review*, read after its publication had been suspended in deference to Rome, something "solider in Germanism and more of it in that way than the *Westminster*; more up to the very latest date than anything we had in England". He knew that the Roman ecclesiastical authorities had no sympathy with this, and the Tractarians less. He had been a Roman Catholic for barely three years when the Vatican Council led him to destroy "the cuttings and offprints—hitherto jealously preserved—of all his published writings", and "to withdraw his confidence from any projects of his own direct public usefulness in ecclesiastical matters". His attitude in the Modernist crisis was substantially the same. But he could find matter for thankfulness even in the decisions that put an end, for the time being at least, to "the ecclesiastical function of the laity", in that they were "in the same moment relieved of their responsibility and set free to deploy their gifts in God's service, the service of truth, as their free conscience might dictate". It is to his biographer's entire credit that of this he conceals nothing, not even the agonized marginalia in Bishop's copy of Father Tyrrell's *Autobiography*, nor a letter to W. C. Bishop, the Anglican liturgiologist, from which the latter loyally obliterated the tell-tale words "modernist" and "modernism".

In the same letter the one wrote to the other: "I am a *hopelessly* perverted pervert to Popery to begin with; and I can't say your 'Church' and my 'Church' are 'all one'; they are not . . . they are extremely different, and I doubt if anything *human* or *divine* can make *them* otherwise." To understand Bishop's attitude to Anglicans we must understand that his Anglo-Catholic phase was brief and ended early. Mr Abercrombie recognizes an element in his understanding of eucharistic origins that was "deeply—ineradicably —conditioned by the way in which he had learnt to read the Bible"; but I am not sure that he has grasped the full effect of Bishop's early old-fashioned Anglicanism not only in his estimate of sobriety in liturgy, but in his sensitiveness to the force of the old Anglican appeal to the Roman canon against the sacrifice of the mass, as this was understood on both sides in the seventeenth century. Bishop's belief that "the devotion of the mass" was a development of the fourth century was in no way inconsistent with his own belief in transubstantiation, but it made him angry with those Anglican liturgists, before and after the Tractarians, who saw a different doctrine of sacrifice in liturgies other than the Roman. This led him to negative conclusions that could be used for controversial ends by different kinds of Anglicans, by F. C. Burkitt as well as Dom Gregory Dix. But as what he called "prehistoric gloom" began to clear towards the end of his life, with the emergence of an island in *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, it seems to me that he was moving towards a new appreciation of the concerns, not of the Oxford men, but of their precursors, and of G. H. Forbes, whom he always reckoned as one of his masters. At least it is important to insist that where his impact was strongest, his conclusions were unfinished. It is

his method that matters. This book should inspire others to go on where he left off, with points that were not taken up, and not only from the use made by others of his provisional conclusions.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

KELHAM.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF KENNETH ESCOTT KIRK. By E. W. Kemp. Hodder and Stoughton. 1959. 20s.

In the brief introduction to Canon Kemp's biographical study there occurs this highly significant passage: "Throughout the book the attempt has been made to present affairs and problems as Dr Kirk saw them. No doubt, in places, this has resulted in a partial and one-sided account which the biographies of other Churchmen yet to be written will correct. It is hoped that this book may be accepted as a fair and balanced portrait of a great theologian and pastoral bishop, but it should also be regarded as a provisional contribution to that impartial history of the Church of England in the first half of the twentieth century which no doubt will be written some two or three generations hence."

It is essential that that frank and honest caveat should be kept in mind if a just estimate is to be formed of the value of this "interim" biography. For at a number of points some of those who were personally involved in controversial issues in which Dr Kirk played a leading part will indeed feel that only one side of the story has been told. The copious—perhaps too copious—quotations from his correspondence and memoranda, while bringing out very forcibly the strength of his convictions, and the clarity of his considered judgments, do a good deal less than justice to the *principles* of those who, in a revealing phrase, are described as "ardent and emotional supporters" of positions with which he disagreed. (The words are Canon Kemp's, not the Bishop's own.)

The story of the life is well told. The early years from 1905–1912 when he was a leading figure in the work of the Student Movement; the experience as a Chaplain in the First War, so vividly illustrated by the quotations from *A Study of Silent Minds*: the return to Oxford in 1919, Tutor at Keble, Fellow and Chaplain of Trinity, Canon of Christ Church and Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology, and finally the seventeen years episcopate.

At three points in the story I was privileged to see his work at close quarters, as an undergraduate two years his junior, as Vicar of the University Church when he was in the full tide of his theological influence, as a fellow member of the Lambeth Committee on Unity in 1948 and of the joint committee of Convocation on South India which presented its report in 1950.

The impressions which remain from those personal memories are amply confirmed in Canon Kemp's pages. There is the massive scholarship revealed in the trilogy of works on Moral Theology, but above all in his Bampton Lectures, *The Vision of God*. There

is the penetrating, logical, and at times surprisingly liberal pastoral judgment which one met when one brought a difficult case of conscience to him. There is the subtlety of mind which made him "delight in finding a round-about and ingenious approach to problems which others would have tackled more directly". No one who was present will forget an occasion during a meeting of the Committee of Convocation when, after a baffling morning's discussion, one member remarked, "I wish to goodness I knew what's really at the back of Kenneth's mind," to be met with the lightning rejoinder from Gregory Dix, "Then you'd better get a corkscrew."

But beneath all these is a deeper current which runs throughout the whole book as it ran throughout the whole life. It appears at an early stage as he reflects on his army experience, when he suggests "that many Churchgoers though saintly are not delightful and consequently do not interest the newcomer, because they are not themselves very interested in our Lord himself" (p. 44). And it shows itself in its fulness in that pastoral episcopate which entered with imaginative sympathy into the problems of village worship (p. 102) and concluded some reflections on the qualifications required for episcopacy with these words: "Finis autem praecepti est caritas de corde puro, et conscientia bona, et fide non ficta. This is as true for Bishops as for any other kind of Christian" (p. 94).

F. A. Cockin, Bishop.

Finches, Marlborough.

The Living World of the Old Testament. By B. W. Anderson. Longmans. 1958. 30s.

The Latter Prophets. By T. Henshaw. Allen and Unwin. 1958. 30s.

Professor Anderson's very readable book presents a picture of the life and atmosphere of the Old Testament, in the context of the history of the ancient Near East, and an assessment of the faith which makes it a unity. The story is related in chronological sequence, with recognition of the need at certain points to interrupt the narrative with some account of parts of the Old Testament—the primeval and patriarchal material, the Wisdom literature—which do not fit satisfactorily into a chronological scheme. It is a deficiency that the Psalter is so little used and, apart from a few odd references, is discussed only in a couple of pages under the heading "The Hymns of the Second Temple". As Professor Anderson rightly says, a detailed discussion of the Psalter "would involve a review of every facet of Israel's faith" (p. 444). But it is just this which suggests that any treatment of the faith such as he is undertaking should frequently draw upon the Psalms for the illustration of the worship and belief of the people, with at some point a more detailed discussion of Psalmody.

It is, of course, always easy to think of matters which ought to have been discussed in a book on the Old Testament. Professor Anderson has given such a vivid and very often illuminating picture of the

istoric faith, that many readers who wish for guidance in finding more satisfying theological understanding will be stimulated to rediscover the vitality of the Old Testament. But in so substantial a book—for it runs to over 500 pages, though admittedly there is much illustration and numerous maps and charts—we may be justified in asking for a more detailed discussion of some of the problems which are alluded to and briefly dismissed. The account is not infrequently too simplified—so the miracle tradition of the Exodus (pp. 40 ff.), the Judges period (p. 104), the picture of Saul (pp. 126 f.), the too political judgment on David (p. 134), the differentiation of Yahweh prophets and Canaanite prophets by describing the former as primarily active in the political sphere (p. 187), the too shallow discussion of Amos (p. 228), the too simple assessment of Isa. 36–39 (pp. 284 ff.), and of Baruch and Jer. 1–25 (p. 328), the treatment of the problems of the restoration (pp. 440 f.), the thin discussion of Haggai and Zechariah, and of post-exilic prophecy generally (pp. 442 ff.—Third Isaiah, mentioned on p. 402, is not further discussed), the chronology of Ezra and Nehemiah (p. 450). Some of this is due to a desire to make things easy; but the survey as a whole suggests that greater detail of discussion would be appropriate, and Professor Anderson has at times a tendency merely to tell a story, and to repeat his comments. Deut. 27 appears for 17 on p. 145, a footnote needs clarifying on p. 157, there is a contradiction between pps. 239 and 267 on the reign of Pekah, some confusion about the dating of Jeremiah's confessions on pp. 339–40, and on the "iron yoke" passage on p. 347. It is odd to describe Ezra's law as "one of the important items" in his baggage (p. 454). A full bibliography is provided but no index of Biblical references.

These criticisms are, however, not in any way intended to suggest that the book as a whole is not useful. It is in fact an extremely valuable survey, and will open up the way to Old Testament study especially for those who already have some knowledge of it.

Mr Henshaw's *The Latter Prophets* is a less satisfying book. It sets out to present "the writings of the Latter Prophets, viewed in the light of modern scholarship". The reader is entitled to expect something more profound than he is given, and an examination of the Bibliography suggests that the author's acquaintance with modern scholarship is very patchy and second-hand. A number of foreign works are mentioned, but there is no note of the new edition of Eissfeldt's *Einleitung*, nor of the new edition of Robinson and Horst on the Minor Prophets, of Fohrer-Galling on Ezekiel, of the series *Das Alte Testament Deutsch*, nor of the new *Biblischer Kommentar*. Nor, surprisingly, is the Interpreter's Bible noted. Indeed, where reference is made in the text to recent literature, there is frequently little to suggest that the work in question has been consulted. The question of oral transmission is dismissed in a paragraph (p. 15), with an allusion to Birkeland (though no reference to Nielsen's *Oral Tradition*, which is, after all, published in this country). The form of the allusion and the subsequent quotations from Eissfeldt's essay in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* suggests that

Mr Henshaw's acquaintance with the topic is limited to that essay. Almost word for word quotation from the same essay is found in the review of Ezekiel research: similarly, allusions to recent work on Nahum and Habakkuk are taken largely if not entirely from that source. The names of Haldar, Bardtke and Rudolph are misspelled.

For the rest, the book contains summaries of the contents of the prophetic books, a repetition of a large number of commonplace and often dubious statements about the prophets and their teaching —including, at this late date, the outmoded cliché "ethical monotheism" (p. 70)—and a good deal of very superficial comment. Major issues of recent discussion—as for example the relationship of the prophets to the cult—are hinted at but never adequately discussed. Thirty pages are devoted to a historical survey, much of which is irrelevant to the book's subject, and much of it out of date: Noth's *Geschichte Israels* has evidently not been used. A chapter on archaeology is unrelated to the book's contents. Appendices deal with a variety of borderline matters, where reference to a Bible dictionary or to the relevant literature could have been made.

PETER R. ACKROYD.

CAMBRIDGE.

THE PHENOMENON OF MAN. By Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. Introduction by Sir Julian Huxley. Collins. 1959. 25s.

This book is one of the riper fruits of the Jesuit tree of knowledge, and to do justice to it in a short review is as difficult as it would be to write the Lord's Prayer on a postage stamp.

Teilhard de Chardin has certainly had the courage to *disregard* the Logical Positivists—and that, in the opinion of one reviewer, is the right way in which to treat them. In spite of disavowals, what the author has given to the world is at least the framework of a philosophy. Sir Julian Huxley requires twenty pages to present a summary; this review has to attempt the impossible in less than two; but *Nil desperandum*:

The author starts with two basic assumptions. The first is that there are two forms of energy—physical and psychical. The second assumption is that psychical energy is ultimately the more powerful. The latter increases in intensity with the complexity of organized units.[1] Mind begins with the cell, but less highly organized units of matter are endowed with "Pre-mind".

Evolution is concerned with the intensification of mind ("Noogenesis"), by convergent integration. In plain English, as matter becomes more complex, mind becomes more intense; the molecule coils up on itself; with the increase in human numbers, the very planet coils up on itself. The roundness of the earth is therefore a crucial part of the theory.

The emergence of man, as man ("Hominization"), was the result of self-awareness. "With the advent of the power of reflection . . .

---

[1] Not "nuits"! See p. 16.

he animal grew in value in relation to the species." The hominiza-ion of the group led to the personalization of the individual—or, as one reviewer would prefer to say, as the group turned in upon tself, and its communications developed, the personality of man leveloped pari passu. Railways and electro-magnetic radiation are ccorded a crucial place in the theory, a theory which reminds one of "Cybernetics".

The hominization of man has produced a new layer upon the surface of the earth—the "Noosphere", which appears to be made up of men, their works, and their means of communication. (Huxley asks, "Is the Noosphere the total pattern of thinking men, *or* their environment?"—*Both*, surely!)

The Noosphere, by convergent integration, will give rise to a hyper-personal organization, and ultimately to a universe of pure mind, appropriately known as "Omega".

One's first thoughts would undoubtedly be to sympathize with the Roman authorities who withheld the "Imprimatur", and the "shaven bowings and duckings" of the "Nihil Obstat". The whole thing looks far too much like Fechner and his materialistic pantheism; far too much like Auguste Comte and his super-personal "Mind of Humanity".[1] Moreover, the flirtation with Lamarck, which Huxley takes very well, cannot be acceptable to the ordinary biologist; while, coupled with the superficial appearance of Pantheism, it must, to the Roman Catholic mind, smell horribly of that Pantheistic "Modernism" which was roundly condemned in the encyclical "Pascendi", as a compendium of all the heresies.

At first sight, the whole tone of the book is anti-Scholastic; certainly anti-Thomist. It *appears* to confound God and man—the cardinal sin in Scholastic eyes. The author clears himself in advance by asserting that he is writing "Hyper-Physics", just as Siger of Brabant cleared himself by arguing that he was a philosopher, and not a theologian! But does he need such a subterfuge?

The "Omega" is the immanent God, who, the author admits, must have resided in the Universe from the beginning. "God," he says, "shall be all in all." Of course, this is not Pantheism in the ordinary sense of the word. God is both the Alpha *and* the Omega. The object of man is *not*, as *The Times* reviewer mistakenly asserted, "to seize the tiller of the Universe", but to constitute himself the divine agent, or channel of activity. Perhaps this *is* slightly heterodox in Roman eyes?

Where the present reviewer would emphatically join issue with Teilhard de Chardin is upon the ground of ethics. The author, a child of his age, although he expresses a very proper detestation of totalitarianism and the "human ant-heap", shows that inadequate respect for the autonomy of the human individual (enough of this modern sophistry, that there is a distinction between an *individual* and a *person*!) which seems to come almost subconsciously from the

[1] When one remembers that Comte would have instituted "saints' days" to were bankers, imagination revolts!

pen of modern writers. He asserts that he believes in "freedom", but talks gaily of the "organization of resources" (which is impossible without a corresponding organization of *people*), and avows a belief in *engenics*. He speaks of human socialization without a shudder. There is little doubt that the theory, *in the form in which he holds it*, involves the acceptance of the organic view of human society. But God (immanent, no doubt) is developing creatures who are more and more highly differentiated from each other, as Herbert Spencer pointed out; and his service is perfect freedom.

BASIL SMITH.

LONDON.

SHORTER NOTICES

LAMENT FOR VICTORY. The Story of King David. By Charles Davey. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 15s.

A LIGHT TO THE NATIONS. An Introduction to the Old Testament. By Norman K. Gottwald. Harper, New York. 1959. $6.50.

A CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By George A. F. Knight. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 30s.

THE CHANGING PATTERN OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES. By H. H. Rowley. The Epworth Press. 1959. 2s. 6d.

These four books in the above-given order conveniently correspond with what may be four stages in the life of a student of the Old Testament. He receives an initial impulse to start him off. He then surveys the whole course. He considers the purpose and end of the journey. He turns aside, perhaps for some years, and then comes back again and tries to find out what has been happening and what the present situation is.

Lament for Victory may well be a way by which a print-hungry and intelligent schoolboy may come to the splendours of J and the early source of Samuel. It has been not unreasonably conjectured that the early source of Samuel may have been written by Abiathar or Ahimaaz, son of Zadok. It has also been held that there is some connexion between this source and J. Mr Davey has had the excellent idea of giving the story of David in the form of a supposed biography written by Abiathar, David's chief priest. He makes him also the author of J. The story is an expanded form of the early source. Pfeiffer writes: "The style of the early source of Samuel is unsurpassed in the whole range of Hebrew prose literature . . . his vivid descriptions and characterizations, and his lively dialogues have seldom if ever been surpassed in the literature of mankind." The style of J has been compared with that of Homer. Mr Davey's own writing does not match, nor would he claim that it did. He nearly makes the story of David rather dull. Nevertheless, *Lament for Victory* was a worthwhile enterprise.

Prof. Gottwald in his preface to *A Light to the Nations* says that

it is "neither a technical introduction to the books of the Hebrew Bible, nor a history of Israel, nor a theology of the Old Testament. It is rather a synthesis of the interests and values of all three." He has, in fact, provided a quite magnificent introduction to the Old Testament for the beginner who intends to take his studies seriously. It will no doubt have a big sale if it comes over here, in spite of its price of approximately 45s. at the present rate of exchange. It is a fair and just price for a good text-book, beautifully produced with most useful charts, maps and photographs. The publishers have also taken the trouble to put it in a most attractive dust-cover. The reviewer's copy had two of them. Is this a usual generous American practice? There is a most useful section entitled Recommended Further Reading. Prof Gottwald is quite clearly a first-rate teacher. Since so much ground is covered it is inevitable that there should occasionally be an over-simplification or skimping. This can be misleading. A characteristic of J is said to be that he uses the name "Israel for the third patriarch (Jacob in E)". This looks like a shorter version of Spurrell's note, "Israel is the name of the third Patriarch, after Gen. 32. 29 (generally)". In what appears to be a summary of Wellhausen's arguments against the Mosaic authorship of the Ten Commandments he hardly does justice to the original.

Mr Knight seeks to introduce his readers to the heart of the Old Testament considered as the Word of God, and he has much that is wise and true to say. "The faith of the Church Catholic has ever been that the Old Testament is revelation of the same God as that revealed in the pages of the New Testament. We might employ St Paul's declaration in 2 Cor. 5. 19 and with the alteration of two words use it to show forth the essential contents of the Old Testament and thus phrase the quotation, 'God was in Israel, seeking to reconcile the world to himself'." He tells us that "the book is written in non-technical language, as far as possible. A 'Church Theology' is naturally meant for the ordinary churchman to read. The narrative form that is used has been adopted at the suggestion of the publisher." Mr Knight lectures in Scotland and it may be that churchmen there will follow his advice. The English may find it rather heavy fare. But it should be particularly useful as an addition to the libraries of ministers or theological students with a very little Hebrew. The Hebraist should be familiar with a good deal of what he has to say or may remind himself of it with the aid of B.D.B.

For some Prof. Rowley's lecture may be the most useful of the four books. Anyone who wishes to have his knowledge of the course of Old Testament studies brought up to date in under an hour needs only to spend 2s. 6d. for this excellent 31-page pamphlet. Here are some extracts. "Archaeology . . . has contributed to bring about a more conservative attitude to some things than formerly prevailed, but it rarely proves or disproves the historical accuracy of events recorded in the Bible. . . . I deprecate any specious simplifying of the issue by selecting convenient bits of the evidence and ignoring the rest, to build up the claim that a particular view has been proved true and the Bible record substantiated." "Texts found at Qumran

confirm the mood of caution in approaching the traditional Hebrew text, but do not invalidate careful textual criticism." "Closer study of the ancient versions has not seldom shown that they did not read the different text that had been supposed but understood the Hebrew word in a sense not given in our Hebrew dictionaries but found in cognate roots in the other Semitic languages." "Nor is it true that the Wellhausen view of the origin of the Pentateuch is dead; and hence any premature celebrating of its obsequies is more amusing than impressive." But Prof. Rowley shows that perhaps he is not so closely in touch with developments in New Testament studies when he says, "There can be little doubt that Jesus believed that he fulfilled in himself the hope of Isaiah 53".

Douglas G. Hill.

Papworth Everard Rectory,
Cambridge.

The Single Eye. By Austin Pardue. Mowbrays. 5s.
In the Sight of the Lord. By Stephen F. Bayne, Jr. Faith Press. 9s. 6d. and 6s.
On the Way. By Olive Wyon. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

These three books, all concerned with the spiritual life, were published early in 1958. *The Single Eye* and *In the Sight of the Lord* are both by American bishops, but they have not much else in common. The former is a book of simple instruction on the Christian life in the contemporary world. Some English readers will find it difficult to surmount the barrier of its American style and setting. Nor is it without traces of the heresy of Norman Vincent Peale's *Power of Positive Thinking*. Behind all the sound and shrewd advice with which the book is packed, one detects the doctrine that one should lead the Christian life because it is the only way to be successful in the modern world. In the first half of the book, Bishop Pardue warns his readers against thinking that prayer consists only in making requests to God. Yet in the second half, which is devoted exclusively to prayer, he tells us virtually nothing about any other kind of prayer. There is one brief reference to penitence and not even one to adoration. There is another to meditation, but this is concerned only with posture.

The defects of *The Single Eye* are remedied in Bishop Bayne's book, which consists of eight meditations for Lent. They are designed to stimulate the reader's own mental prayer and can hardly fail to do so. Each one provides food for many hours of meditation, but the temptation for the reader will be to go straight through the book without stopping. For it is simple, profound and enthralling, and the meditations are not easily divisible. It searches the conscience. It demands constant re-reading. The author knows both God and himself and his book deserves the highest praise, for it will certainly help many others along the road to that knowledge. There is one misprint on page 137, where Christ is said to have "resigned" instead of "reigned" from the Cross.

On the Way is full of good things—perhaps too full. It leads the Christian from agnosticism to perfection in 126 pages. The pace will probably be too hot for the reader who needs the kind of help offered in the early chapters. But I shall give this book with confidence to an intelligent middle-aged confirmation candidate in the belief that it will open his eyes to the true goal of the Christian life.

Dr Wyon reverses the traditional sequence of things by treating of contemplation before meditation. This I believe to be right. It is surely a great mistake to reserve contemplative prayer for a few chosen souls. There must be many Christians who can never make a profitable discursive meditation even with such help as is given by Bishop Bayne. For they lack either the intelligence or the imagination required. But in the end we must all come to contemplate the divine loveliness; and the sooner we learn to do this the better. "Be silent unto God, and let Him mould thee" (p. 107). That, Dr Wyon teaches, is what prayer is for.

PETER GRAHAM.

EATON BRAY.

BOOK NOTES

Stages in Prayer by John G. Arintero, O.P. (Blackfriars, 12s.), is a summary of the teachings of the recognized Western mystics on progress in the life of prayer. It is heavy going, but could be useful to the director who has not studied the original authors. *Letters of Direction* by Bossuet, translated from the French by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (Mowbrays, Fleur de Lys Series, 5s.), is an excellent selection, beautifully translated, which reveals the true greatness of the author as a spiritual guide. *The Imagery of the Pilgrim Psalms* by G. E. Phillips (S.P.C.K., Little Books on Religion, No. 219, 1s. 9d.) is an aid to meditation on Psalms 120–34, emphasizing and illuminating the psalmist's use of imagery in speaking of God. *Meditations on the Gospel of St John* by Adrienne von Speyr (Collins, 16s.) is a sequel to her book *The Word*, which was reviewed in THEOLOGY, February 1954, pp. 71 f., and has the same qualities. This volume runs from chap. 1. 19 to 5. 47 of the Gospel. *The Praying Christ* by J. G. S. S. Thomson (Tyndale Press, 10s. 6d.) is a study of our Lord's teaching and practice regarding prayer in the light of the Gospel records. Oliver and Boyd are producing a new translation of Calvin's Commentaries on the New Testament. Readers whose appetite has been whetted by the extracts in Volume XXIII of "The Library of Christian Classics" (see THEOLOGY, September 1958, p. 354) will welcome the complete texts. *The Gospel according to St John* 1–10, translated by T. H. L. Parker, has already appeared (25s.). From Oliver and Boyd also comes *Christmas* by Karl Barth (7s. 6d.), which contains meditations that he wrote for German daily newspapers between 1926 and 1933. *Father Paul of Graymoor* by David Gannon (Macmillan, 34s. 6d.) is a biography of the founder of the Society of the Atonement, a religious community in the U.S.A., which was originally Anglican but at an early stage became Roman Catholic. The book was first published in 1951; it has a foreword by Cardinal Spellman. *Revelation and the Bible*, edited by Carl F. H. Henry (Tyndale Press, 17s. 6d.), is a symposium in which a number of conservative evangelical scholars discuss various aspects of the authority of Holy Scripture. There are twenty-four essays, and the book has over 400 pages, so that the price is remarkably low. *The Meaning of Protestantism: an account of its origin and development* by James Nichols (Collins, Fontana Books, 2s. 6d.) was first published in the U.S.A. in 1947: it too must be accounted a bargain. *I Believe* by Abbé Jean Mouroux (Geoffrey Chapman, 8s. 6d.) is an exposition of the nature of Christian faith in terms of personal encounter. *The Undying Fire* by Dewi

Morgan (Mowbrays, 6s.) contains brief lives of twenty-two contemporary Christians. Burns and Oates have published three more "Faith and Fact Books" whose titles speak for themselves: *The Problem of Evil* by François Petit, O.Praem.; *Is Theology a Science?* by M. D. Chenu, O.P.; and *Post-Reformation Spirituality* by Louis Cognet (7s. 6d.) each). All who are interested in the French Protestant community at Taizé will be glad to know that its eucharistic liturgy is now available: *Eucharistie: la liturgie eucharistique, dimanches et fêtes* (Presses de Taizé, 900 frs); likewise *Introduction à la retraite spirituelle* (n.p.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

American Church Publications: Darwell Stone and F. W. Puller, *Who are Members of the Church?* [reprint of criticism of Lambeth Conference 1920 definition] ($1.00).

Anglican Truth Society (Sydney): A. P. B. Bennie, *The Church, Marriage and the 20th Century* (5s.).

Cambridge University Press: C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St Mark* (40s.).

Chichester City Council: W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Chichester Cathedral in the Nineteenth Century* (3s.).

Church Book Room Press: J. Stafford Wright, *Spiritualism* (1s.).

Church Literature Association: E. L. Mascall, *Women and the Priesthood of the Church* (3s.).

Church of Christ (Athens): Theodor Lanaras, *Extract from the Holy Scriptures above Science* (n.p.).

Churches of Christ Publishing Committee: James Gray (Ed.), *Studies on Baptism* (2s. 6d.).

Collins: C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* [the Moffatt commentary unabridged: reviewed in Theology, February 1933, pp. 111 f.] (2s. 6d.).

Robert Hale: A. M. Hadfield, *An Introduction to Charles Williams* (21s.).

Highway Press: Keith Cole, *Kenya: Hanging in the Middle Way* (5s.).

Hodder and Stoughton: Frank Drake, *Thy Son Liveth* [the story of the death from cancer of the author's son at the age of 28] (10s. 6d.).

Longmans: André Neher, *Moses and the Vocation of the Jewish People* (6s.).

Macmillan: *Divine Healing* [six articles that appeared in the *Nursing Times* during 1959] (1s. 6d.).

Mowbrays: J. N. Thompson, *I Want to Live* [revised edition: addresses to young people] (6s.).

Mowbrays (for the Alcuin Club): R. C. D. Jasper, *The Position of the Celebrant at the Eucharist* (2s. 6d.).

St Anthony's Press: R. L. Storey, *Diocesan Administration in the Fifteenth Century* (3s. 6d.); J. S. Purvis, *Educational Records* (30s.).

S.C.M. Press: Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (42s.).

Sheed and Ward: Cecily Hastings, Vincent Rochford, and Alexander Jones, *Pattern of Scripture* (3s. 6d.); J. P. Arendzen, *Christ is God* (3s. 6d.); Bruce Vawter, C.M., *The Bible in the Church* (3s. 6d.).

Society of St John the Evangelist: *Cowley: S.S.J.E.* [an illustrated brochure on the life and work of the Cowley Fathers] (2s. 6d.).

Stanford University Press (O.U.P.): Leo F. Solt, *Saints in Arms* (25s.); Olive J. Brose, *Church and Parliament* (27s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON